Date: Mon, 31 Mar 1997 23:12:21 -0700
From: PMSTAND0@wcc.com (PMSTAND0)
Subject: Component Integration Team Minutes: 31 Mar 97
To: bfong@water.ca.gov, davef@water.ca.gov, ddaniel@water.ca.gov, lorenb@water.ca.gov, ronott@water.ca.gov, rsoehren@water.ca.gov, rwoodard@water.ca.gov, sbuer@water.ca.gov, schmutte@water.ca.gov, syaeger@water.ca.gov, lsnow@water.ca.gov
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

Attendees: Steve Yaeger, Rick Woodard, Stein Buer, Bellory Fong, Dick Daniel, Ron Ott, Peter Standish-Lee

This was a shortened meeting because part of the time had been reallocated for the Impact Assessment Team Leader meeting.

Initial discussion pertained to level of detail w.r.t. common program actions and alternatives. Rick explained difficulty of developing the needed numbers for water quality constituent loading reductions without w.q. model runs to determine receiving water impacts (e.g. # of lbs of Cu reduction needed at Iron Mtn Mine). Yet we need these numbers.

For Se contaminated land quantities Rick suggested we could use the most recent San Joaquin Valley Drainage Study ("Rainbow Report"). Pressure from an environmental stakeholder to quantify ag lands to be removed from production had yielded an estimate (250K A.) which seemed to satisfy them. Rick felt that there would be a strong reaction from the ag community to the redirected impacts. Others pointed out the reality that improvements to water supply and water quality that benefit ag and other users require land use conversions that foreclose ag, e.g. the IF requires 16,000 Acres and Sites Reservoir requires 46,000 Acres.

More details on water quality and system integrity actions are needed for the Alternative descriptions. Rick is working on a redraft of the water quality actions with some new categories (e.g. management of Delta islands for ag drainage control is now placed under drinking water safety).

Apparently there was still disagreement this AM on the process to screen and reduce the number of alts. Stein reiterated his belief that this was best accomplished by using costs, feasibility, and impacts as screening criteria to define the end points ("bookends") of ranges of alts (versus developing a single alt.). Using this process, Alt 1 would attempt to achieve program objectives by using a range of storage and other available actions. Alt 2 presents more difficulties, especially with the CUWA concept (because we are lacking

the knowledge and tools needed to fully evaluate it). The Herbold (EPA) alt. presents difficulties also and Stein was alerted to look out for a letter from EPA describing revisions to this alt in which the middle (SJR) intake is extended all the way north to Hood (making it a true dual system and transposing it from a 2 sub. alt. to a 3 sub. alt.).

Discussion of CUWA alt. at first focused on possible fatal flaws e.g. adverse Central Delta temperature increases or encountering unwilling right-of-way land sellers. However, Steve said that elimination of any alternative should be based on application of the full decision-matrix method, focusing on the differences and linkages.

A discussion of usefulness of a 5,000 cfs IF focused on the ability to maintain separation of the higher quality drinking water supply following diversion from N. Delta. One economical new idea consisted of "multiplexing" the higher quality water through the aqueduct in slugs, possibly separated from poorer quality water by "pigs" (flexible barriers that would slide through the aqueduct). Stein said this might be feasible but further evaluation was needed to be sure.

Rick noted another consideration that might affect the need for separation: i.e. that the urban water purveyors may be able to handle TOC and bromides with treatment, as long as they don't have to deal with both simultaneously. Winter is the worst season for TOC he said (whereas summer is worst for bromides).

In discussion of the 15K cfs IF, Curt Schmutte (not present) had stated he would propose PL99 standards for remaining Delta levees but not a need to implement seismic standards. There were questions as to whether this would meet solution principles (i.e. provide the same level of Delta levee protection with all alts. regardless of the selected conveyance mode).

Dick noted potential competition for dredged material since both the Levees and ERPP programs need material and there is not enough available in the system to meet both needs. The linkage to the IF (which would yield abundant soil for use as construction raw material) was evident.

Discussion of the 5,000 cfs facility targeted impacts on special status species. There is an apparent preference among the fish biologists for the 15K cfs sized IF, because it would not result in the concentration of fish into the smaller volume of water continuing to flow through the Delta during the critical periods.

Ron pointed out the problem of apparent lack of a feasible means to screen through-Delta flows. Stein did feel that the upstream migrant

passage aspect of the problem could be dealt with effectively. Problems of adequately screening in-Delta diversions pointed to a probable need to consolidate diversion locations (note linkages). Dick said he would like to preclude (powered?) vessels from certain ecologically sensitive areas of the Delta.

PSL/psl